

O R,

BEING AN

TO

Printed by J. Morphew, near Stationers-Hall. 1718.

ART HISTORY
VOLUME





The SECOND Part
OF THE
INVALIDITY
OF THE
Dissenting Ministry.



IS usual with Mr. Peirce, to set out with a Prologue of Prejudication; In his *Remarks* on Dr. Wells his Letter to Mr. Peter Dowly, he begins with this, that he thought it *deserv'd none*. And as to my Answer to his Sermon, he sets out thus, *The World is not concern'd in laying open the Weaknesses of an unknown Author, when he says little by way of Argument, but what every ordinary Reader may see thro'.* Now tho' such poor Pretences may serve to sink the Credit of his Adversary, amongst his prejudic'd Admirers, he can't well expect, they will go down with Men of good Sense. But that he mayn't impose even upon those who are contented with the Appearances of Things: I shall bestow a particular Examination upon what
A he

he has been pleas'd to Reply. And that he may have no ground of Complaint (as 'tis my Unhappiness to have with him) with regard to Misrepresentation, I shall examin his *Defence Paragraph* by Paragraph.

And, first, he says, that *he is much surpriz'd, that they who thought an Answer adviseable, should judge that which is publish'd tolerable.* I assure him, when I set about it, I did not know that any Body, besides my self, *thought an Answer adviseable*; mine was purely voluntary, and I advis'd with no Body about it. We have Truth on our side, and therefore have no *Meetings* that I know of, to concert Answers. But the Chief Motive that induced me, was to undeceive those well-meaning, but ignorant Dissenters, who imagine that their *Teachers* do minister among them, by *Christ's Commission and Authority*; and that therefore they may *Lawfully* use their Ministry. I was indeed the more encouraged to this, when I found the Sermon was preached by a Person of uncommon *Abilities* amongst them, and therefore hoped, that if any thing could be said to the purpose for a *Fact*, that I maintained, had neither Scripture nor Antiquity to support it; His Defence at least would be *Tolerable*. But I find my self disappointed, tho' I still think it proceeds not from any Defect in the *Defender*, but that his Cause would not bear it. But whether this be so or no, the Reader must judge for himself, upon Tryal made of it.

Mr. P. tells me, that *he was at a loss what Notion to form of me; he thinks my way of writing to be like the Declamations of a Person, who had just left the University*; that I begin and fill up a great part of my Book with meer Harangue instead of Argument. But all this is saying and not proving: Had I indeed harangued on his Text, and to who was to judge of their Qualifications, and authorize them to the Office? Answered, and that was Timothy; *The same commit THOU*; and after all, without the least Intimation from Scripture, insisted, that others, notwithstanding of the Charge, *The same commit Thou*, were to join with him, and then called my Sermon *Presbyterian Ordination* proved Regular. This indeed had been to my thinking Harangue instead of Argument.

But these were his first; by his second Thoughts, he determines that *I must necessarily have left the University long ago*; since, says Mr. P. *he has forgot the very Terms of Disputation, and talks of the Sequel of the Major in a Categorical Syllogism.* This he stept out of his way, to observe elsewhere, viz. *Impartial View and Censure*, p. 11. Now after all this Trouble that he gave him-
self,

self, 'tis pity there should be so little Candor in the Representation? The Major was this, *Now the same that presided, the same also ordained.* To shew the Fallacy of which, because it was really a *Conditional Proposition*, as to the Matter, tho' to conceal that, it was formed otherwise; therefore I resolved it thus, *allowing that Presbyters Presided, it does not follow that the same Ordained*, p. 10. and I all along insist upon this View of it: And this *Consequence*, which was word for word the same in the Major, I call the *Sequel of his Major*, and the Part chiefly to be proved. In respect to the Form I had reduced it to, which was evidently this, *If Presbyters Presided, the same also Ordained*; and which, with Mr. P's good leave, is the Major of a *Hypothetical not Categorical Syllogism*. This was obvious enough, but it was not for his turn, and puts me in mind of what the late Learned Dr. Sherlock observes, *Pref. to Disc. of Church Unity*, p. 4. That there are some who don't fight with *Mens Books*, but with their *Reputations*; and have no other way of *Answering Arguments* but by picking up some *By-Sayings*, which, with the help of an *ingenious Comment*, may expose the Author, and then there is no need of answering his Book. How far Mr. P. is concerned in this Character, his Writings will best testify; I am at present to attend him, while he gives the Reader some brief View of my Performance.

The Charge, says Mr. P. of a great part of the Clergies *prevaricating with God and Man is put off, with a hope they do not with Man, and an Assurance they can't think it safe to prevaricate with God, an omniscient Being*; and with the same *Plausibleness*, says he, *he might have vindicated Mr. Paul, and the rest of the Rebels, when in arms at Preston and Dumblain*. Now if the Clergy can't be vindicated with more *Plausibleness*, than those who were actually in arms; will not the Law reach them? Let him first try to make good his Charge, by better Proofs than his *Libel* carries; and then make the Comparison. But the Clergy are not the only Persons thus maliciously Re-proached; one of the most Celebrated Fountains of Learning in the World, has not escaped the being by him *slanderosly reported*.

He tells me, *I deny that the gross Wickedness of such as pretend to be Ministers proves them false Prophets in direct Opposition to our Saviour*. Such as pretend to be Ministers! I said no such thing; bare Pretences are all on his side; it was with regard to the gross Wickedness of such as have a valid Mission that I said, "It must be confessed, these Fruits will prove Men very wicked, but it will not prove them to be false Pro-

“ phets, by which I suppose he means Ministers, *i. e.* such as have “ *Authority in the Word and Sacraments.*” As I immediately explain’d my meaning by Bishop Burnet’s Exposition on the 26th Article, which Article expressly tells us, that *the effect of Christs institution is not taken away by their Wickedness.* So that he impeaches the Article which he himself has Subscribed, if this be *in direct Opposition*, if not, he can have no excuse for such a false Suggestion.

And whereas, he says, I query, *why a great part, and not all those who would invalidate all their Ministrations; and could not perceive the obvious Reason, that he does not charge all with those Fruits:* Now the not charging all with those Fruits is not the Point. *The obvious Reason* that I can’t yet perceive is, why those Fruits should be a Warrant to the People of England to beware of a great part, and not all who would invalidate. That not being the Consequence of those Fruits: I told him plainly, but he takes no notice of it, “ That “ it will only follow that we must beware of them, because “ of those Fruits; not because they would invalidate’. For if that were the Reason, it would reach the Good as well as the Bad who do so. I grant *his charging a great part, is a manifest Exception of the rest*, but without any Reason that I can yet perceive, they being all alike guilty as to the invalidating part. To beware of Men because of *those Fruits*, is a Gospel Doctrine, but to beware of Men charg’d with those Fruits, because they would invalidate all *Dissenting Ministrations*, is a Doctrine peculiar to the *Conventicle*, or rather to Mr. P. who has the best Claim to the Glory of the Invention. So that my charging him with want of Candor and Sincerity stands good so far.

He learnedly observes, says Mr. P. *that the invalidating our Ministrations is none of the Fruits mention’d by our Saviour, nor did I suggest it was, but insisted upon such Crimes as were notorious, and omitted what might look like a begging the thing in Question.* And was it not as learnedly observed by him that *our blessed Saviour bids his Followers, beware of those false Prophets, without mentioning any thing of their Mission.* When ’tis so evident from Scripture, that such false Prophets had no Mission. “ False Prophets (says Dr. Whitby in his Notes on the “ place) both in the Old and New Testament do always signify such Persons as falsely pretend a Commission from God “ for what they teach, or who promise or foretel things falsely “ in his Name’. But did he not suggest it was in the Warrant? when to our Blessed Saviour’s Words he adds, and with-

out all doubt this is a *Warrant to the People of England to beware of a great part of those who would invalidate all our Ministrations*. What then is the meaning of these Words? is it to make it a Warrant and no Warrant? a Warrant *without all doubt* says "Mr. P. to the People of England, to beware of a great part of those who would invalidate. But I did not suggest that this was specified in the Warrant". It can therefore be no Warrant on that account. And since it was neither specified in the Warrant, nor suggested by Mr. P. how came he to say, it was a *warrant to beware of a great part of those who would invalidate*? 'tis altogether as reasonable to pretend to take up a sober Man, with a Warrant issued out for a Drunkard, as to plead a *Warrant* that has no more Relation to *Invalidating*, than Sobriety has to Drunkenness.

As to his pretending that he insisted upon such Crimes as were Notorious, and omitted what might look like a begging the thing in Question. If his saying so can make such Crimes notorious, he has effectually done it. But after all he has not omitted, *what might look like a begging the thing in Question*. For what he calls his *undoubted Warrant* to the People of England, to beware of a great part of those who would invalidate all Dissenting Ministrations, is as manifest a begging the thing in Question as ever I saw in all my Life; and whatever he may suppose, I am persuaded, that his *Answerer*, to the best of his Knowledge, hath not taken the same Course.

He next complains that I represent him as subscribing one Doctrine, and teaching the contrary, because I think he differs from Bishop Burnet's Exposition of the 26th Article, and talk as tho' he had subscribed Bishop Burnet and not the Articles. Now I assure him this was not the *Because*. The true Reason that I said so was, because the Doctrine taught by him, is contrary to the Literal and Grammatical Sense of the Article, which he Subscribed; I never talk as tho' he had subscribed Bishop Burnet, tho' if he had, that had been more commendable, than his Dispersing so many Stories of Bishop Burnet, so much to the prejudice of his Memory. But is my Representation a Mistake or no? Is not his openly declaring that the Crimes alledged by him, do *evidently prove Men false Prophets*, (i. e. if I understand him right, having no Authority in the Ministrations of the Word and Sacraments) and teach us to beware of them. And that if such Fruits are not bad enough to prove this, (i. e. that they have no Authority,) he can't conceive what use our Saviours Rule can be of. Is not this I say to subscribe one Doctrine, and teach the contrary? The 26th Article is so plain, that there is no evading of this.

And

And indeed he does not attempt it, any otherwise, than by this Bold and False innuendo, p. 5. *tho' if I were Guilty of such Prevarication, I should have hardly expected a Church-Man should reproach me with it.* Now those Church-Men 'tis confessed must be as Guilty as he who in Subscribing prevaricate against the Literal and Grammatical Sense of any Article. Where the Article may have different Senses, and if the Words will bear them, it is Bishop Burnet's opinion, that both Sides may subscribe the Article, with a good Conscience, and without any Equivocation (*v. Expos. 39. Articles p. 8.*). But this is not the Case of the 26th Article; and therefore I conceive, I am under no mistake in representing Mr. P. as subscribing one Doctrine, and teaching the Contrary. And now having attended him so far, Paragraph by Paragraph, Let the impartial Reader judge, if he had any just Ground, to say, *so many Blunders there are in about a Page and an half of his Answer.* The Blunders, if any, are owing to his unjust Comment on my Words, and therefore they are his own and not mine, as I am apt to think all the rest he hints at would have been, had he, without wasting his time, taken Notice of them.

But for fear of that, and unprofitably, as he pretends, *trespassing upon his Readers patience,* he skips over two Pages, and observes that I am sometimes Witty, in retorting his Words upon him, inserting Comical Parentheses to expose them. He says, I tell him, "his way of managing the Controversy about Ordination has been what they would certainly have Chosen, who had design'd to (please not) puzzle the common People (I added, both Independents and Presbyterians, however opposite, yet his good Friends) rather than inform them;" to which he answers, and this is true; I design'd to please them (as the making things easy and plain is the way to do it), and not puzzle them rather than inform them. Now let him make things as plain and easy as he pleases, yet 'tis but a bad way of pleasing, if they be destitute of Truth; and the two Parties as much puzzled as ever, to reconcile their own Principles which are so opposite, by his two Sermons. I can't see therefore, how he can pertinently apply his Latin Quotation to me, for I praise him no otherwise than, *Egregiam vero laudem & spolia ampla refertis*, in Virgil, may be applied to him. He has given up the Divine Right of Presbytery, by his *useful Ministry a Valid one*; and it seems it was not so pleasing, for he tells us in the Preface to the other Sermon, *'twas the unhappiness of that Sermon to be misunderstood by some*; and in the other Sermon, *Presbyterian Ordination prov'd Regular*, the blame of troubling the World with which, he lays upon those Some: he endeavours

endeavours to Refute the Congregational way from his Text; pray what sort of pleasing is this? This is in my opinion so far from making things easy and plain to both Parties, that what the Learned Dr. Hole observes of him, I'm afraid will be found too true, viz. *that he labours hard to Delude the unwary Vulgar, to instil the Poison of Errors and Divisions, and seeks not so much to Edifie them in Sound Doctrine, as to entertain and gratify them with PLEASING Novelties and Varieties.* v. Antidote 2d. Part p. 6.

He quarrels, says Mr. P, with my Gloss upon 2 Cor. 1. 24. I quarrel'd with it justly, for the innuendo, that was given thereby against Episcopacy; and do still assert that, as the Apostles had a Power given them from God to Edification, so have the Bishops their proper Successors, whom we are to obey in all Lawful things, as having the Rule over us. He has, says Mr. P, from Dr. Whitby, borrowed Theodorit's Exposition, which as the Doctor has set it down, is plausible, but out of what humour I know not, he must add a little of his own to make a Contradiction of it. Now if borrowing from Dr. Whitby be a Crime, I'm afraid Mr. P. will be found equally Guilty. For his Criticism on *οὐκ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν* p. 25th of his Sermon amounts to as much as he charges me with (v. Dr. Whitby on Math. 28. 20.). But wherein have I made a Contradiction of it?

Why, because I say, *The Apostle in this Verse expressly asserts his having Dominion.* Now the reason why I said so was, because the Word in the Original, signifies to exercise Dominion; and therefore I say, " he expressly asserts his having Dominion, but " he did not, as Theodoret expounds it, by this Threat, challenge to himself a Power to exercise any Dominion over " them on the account of their Faith, as he did upon Hymeneus and Alexander, 1 Tim. 1. 10. To this he Queries and is his not challenging expressly the asserting a thing? No, But his not challenging to exercise his Dominion, is, as I conceive it, expressly asserting he had Dominion, but pretended not to such a Dominion over their Faith; and if it is not, yet what Mr. P. grants is enough for my purpose. Such ways of speaking, says he, often seem to imply a thing, but that is different from an express Assertion. If it be then implied here, that will overthrow his Gloss. But this he endeavours to evade, by adding, and that they don't always so much as imply a thing, he may see by comparing another place in that Epistle, Chap. 3. 5. But the Question is, whether it be implied here. I am not now concerned whether it is always so or no. That it is at least implied here is evident from the Word *κυριεύουσαν*, which is

is not in *Chap. 3. 5.* and not only *Dr. Hammond* on the place, but the *Synopsis* confirms this. *Quare non est quod metuat ne Fidei causa potestatem Apostolicam, quam Dominationem amuli mei interpretantur, in vos exerceam.*

But *Mr. P.* takes upon him, *out of what humour I know not*, to say, he could alledge *Chrylostom* against *Theodorit*; his *Interpretation*, says he, will not allow so much as his implying that he had *Dominion*: no doubt there are some Readers who will take his bare Word for this. But that the Impartial Reader mayn't be imposed upon, *St Chrystom's* words on the place are these, *τετίστιν ἡ δὲ τὴν εἰπόν, ὅτι Φειδόμενος ὑμῶν ἐκ ἡλθόν ὡς κυ-
εἰν ὑμῶν, οὐκ ἔπειν, ὑμῶν, ἀλλὰ ὅτι πίστεος, ὃ οὐ παρότερον ἐν, καὶ
ἀληθέστερον. καὶ ὅτι μὴ βεβηκότα πιστεύσαι. τίς κρείων ἀναστρέφει.* Not that we have *Dominion* over your Faith, that is, I did not therefore say that to spare you I came not, as if I had Lorded it over you, neither did he say *YOU*, but what was more mild and true, *YOUR FAITH*. For who can force a Man to Believe, that is unwilling to it? Now if it was more true not to say you, but your Faith, how can any one alledge *Chrystom* against *Theodorit*, for it was as true to say you as your Faith, if the Apostle had no more *Dominion* over the one, than over the other. For tho' an unwilling Person can't be forc'd to Believe, yet as to Believers, *St. Paul* had an Apostolical Rod in a readiness to revenge all *Disobedience*. *2 Cor. 10. 6.* And he not only speaks of his Authority to prescribe Rules, but of enforcing these Rules with suitable Punishments; and we find in the 7th, 8th, 11th, and 14th Chapters, of the *1 Cor.* Laws and Directions, many of which were never expressly enjoin'd by Christ.

But to shew his great disregard to the Fathers, *Mr. P.* adds, *but I value Mr. Lock as a Commentator above them both, and he explains the Apostle as I do.* Does he? Let the Reader then be Judge; *Mr. P's* words are these, we pretend not to a Power to dictate to you of our own Heads--- we have no Authority in Controversies of Faith, to determine what Christ himself in his Life time, or by his Spirit since his Departure has not determined. *Mr. Lock's* words are these, not that I pretend to such a Dominion over your Faith, as to require you to Believe what I have taught you, without coming to you, when I am expected there, to **MAINTAIN and MAKE IT GOOD.**

" He represents me, says *Mr. P.* as endeavouring to prove the " Regularity of *Presbyterian Ordination* from the Text, which " I never attempt, in opposition to the *Episcopal*, but only consider it as an Objection, which I therefore Answer". Now whether he meant at all to prove *Presbyterian Ordination* Regular

gular, can only be learn'd from his Title Page; for it will puzzle any Man, not under powerful Prejudices, to point to the place in the Sermon, where this Proof is to be found; and therefore I could not represent him as endeavouring to prove it from the Text. I found he had chosen a Text nothing to his purpose, nay very much to the contrary, which made me wonder at the prevailing Power he had over himself to tell the World that the Regularity of Presbyterian Ordination was proved by him, when his Text was a direct Contradiction to it; and it was impossible to bend it to a Compliance with his Scheme.

When he comes to consider who was to judge of Mens Qualifications for the sacred Office, and to authorise them to it, he frankly says *now that was Timothy*; and *this*, says he, *I the rather take notice of, that I may shew you the Grounds and Reasons of our Practice*; and *that we have good warrant for what we do as Ministers in this matter*. Now one would think, that after this he would certainly *shew the Grounds and Reasons of their Practice*. But that is yet to come; for all he shews for this is, 1. To refute by the Text Those who lodge this matter wholly in the Body of the People; which, with a little Variation, will overthrow *the Grounds and Reasons of his own Practice*. 2. To answer the Objections of those who lodge Ordination only in a Diocesan Bishop. But how this can *shew the Grounds and Reasons of his Practice*, is what I can't see thro', unless this be a good Argument, The Congregational way is refuted by the Text, and the *Objections* of those of the Episcopal way from it, will admit of an easy Solution; Ergo, Presbyterian Ordination is Regular.

For, supposing he had solved *the Objections of the latter*, how does he shew that the Dissenting Ministry have good warrant for what they do as Ministers, i. e. meer Presbyters, in this matter, 'tis certain here was a single Person, not a Presbytery appointed for this matter; 'tis certain there is no mention here of any Presbyters joining with him, nor any Intimation afterwards that they were to do it with or without him. The Charge, *Commit Thou*, for any thing that appears to the contrary, is devolved on Timothy alone; and therefore 'tis altogether as reasonable to *shew the Grounds and Reasons of their Practice* from *Diotrephes loveth to have the Preeminence*, as from the Charge *Commit Thou*; which he had better taken no notice of, than to have done it so little to the purpose.

He excuses, says Mr. P. the extent of the Bishop of London's Diocese, by its being a Circumstance, an accidental Circumstance and not essential, which are Terms of Art used that he may seem to Answer what he has nothing to say to. Now I may more justly retort that he calls these Terms of Art, that he himself may seem to answer what he has nothing to say to. For all the Art in the World can never make an accidental Circumstance to be essential. If the Apostles have instituted one Form of Government for all particular Churches; If every Bishop is vested with a Superiority of Power as well as Order, it seems strange to me, that a Bishop of a large Diocese should not be thought as much a Divine Institution as a Bishop of a lesser. If the Government be the same, larger and lesser Limits don't alter the Species of a particular Church. Tho' the Bounds be not of Divine Institution, the Bishop is an Officer of Divine Appointment.

But, says he, Circumstances make the vastest Alterations in Things; one asks Money of me in the Street with his Hat in his Hand; another asks it of me in the Road, with a Pistol at my Breast: These are but Circumstances in the asking, but make difference enough. What poor Sophistry is here! Do these Circumstances make any Specific Difference in the Men? By what Logick will he prove this? If they don't, as I think, he will not take upon him to say, they do; then to what end was this Comparison made; why he knows it will take with unthinking People, who are contented with the Appearances of things, and that answers his End. But granting that Circumstances make the vastest Alterations in things, yet this is certain, that the Species of a thing, must be determin'd by its constant Nature, and not by that which is only accidental, and can make no Specific Difference. No doubt these Circumstances make Difference enough, but not enough to alter the Species. Therefore, though I have nothing to say to his Pistol, I have still something to say to his Principles.

In which sometimes I find we agree. No doubt, says he, the Circumstance he talks of is not essential to a Bishop. I grant it. But then I deny what he adds, that 'tis destructive of the Design of the Office; and that Confirmation must be made a Fest of by me, or I can never defend the Bishops having a Diocese in such distant Parts of the World. For Necessity excuses that Want; the wilful Neglect and Contempt of Confirmation, which makes the thing sinful, being peculiar to Dissenters, not to those under the Bishops Care, in such distant Parts of the World; and

and 'tis Mr. P. and his Brethren, not I, who make a Jest of it.

Let him try, says Mr. P. how capable any Man can be to do the Business of a Bishop in such a Diocese by the way in which Ignatius or any Writer of the Three first Centuries speaks of it. Now I am willing to stand to this tryal, being well assured that Mr. P. and his Brethren dare not stand to be try'd by Ignatius for their pretended Warrant in acting without, and in opposition to the Bishop; and I do maintain, that a Man is as capable to do the Business of a Bishop in a large Diocese now, as Cornelius was, in the third Century, who had (v. Euseb. E. H. l. 6. c. 37. & 43.) 46 Presbyters, 7 Deacons, 7 Sub-Deacons, 94 of the Inferior Orders of the Clergy, 1500 Poor, maintain'd by the publick Stock of the Church, and as he himself calls it, an infinite and numberless People, in his Diocese; or as St. Cyprian, in whose Diocese the Number of the Lapsed was so great, that every Day Thousands of Tickets were granted in their Behalf, and in one of those Tickets 20 or 30 Persons might, as St. Cyprian complains, be comprehended, v. Cyp. Ep. 15. & 11. Edit. Goulart. Now if Mr. P. thinks, that notwithstanding of this, there was no Diocesan Episcopacy in the Three first Centuries, let him try how capable he is to answer the Learned Dr. Maurice's Defence of it, or for the future forbear such Innuendo's. All Bishops were then as they are now, *ejusdem sacerdotii & autoritatis*, larger and lesser Limits made no difference. A Bishop with a few subject Presbyters, and one Congregation was and is as much a Bishop as he that sits in St. Peter's Chair. Dioceses did then as they do now, differ very much in Extent, yet they had all the same Species of Government, the Essence of which consisted not in larger or lesser Bounds.

But says Mr. P. Is it not absurd for him to argue from Cyprian, that Bishops are all *ejusdem sacerdotii & ordinis* (I said *Autoritatis*) and therefore the Pope may not assume to himself a Superiority of Power (I added and Authority) over his Colleagues; and yet in the same Page plead for the Largeness of a Diocese, by Cyprian's having the Inspection of a Province, wherein 'tis certain there were many Bishops. Now he must borrow Mr. P's Spectacles that can pretend to see this Absurdity. For 'tis most certain that all Bishops are *ejusdem Sacerdotii & Autoritatis*; and therefore the Pope may not assume to himself a Superiority of Power and Authority over his Colleagues. There being no such thing as an *Episcopus Episcoporum* to be

allowed. But my pleading for the Largeness of a Diocese from St. Cyprian's having the Inspection of a Province, was to shew not only his Metropolitcal Power, but that larger and lesser Bounds made no Specifical Difference in Bishops. For tho' all Bishops have originally equal Right and Power in Church Affairs, yet there may be a Primacy of Order granted to some Bishops and their Chairs by general Consent, and under the Regulation of Ecclesiastical Canons, for the Preservation of Catholick Unity and Communion, without any Antichristian Encroachment or Usurpation on Episcopal Authority. (v. Vindic. Def. of Dr. Stillingfleet, p. 128.) Besides, I pleaded for the Largeness of a Diocese from Theodoret's, which consisted of 800 Parishes. And this, since he wants to be informed about it, is proved from Theodoret's Epistle to Leo, Ep. 113. and more particularly from Dr. Stillingfleet's Unreasonableness of Separation, p. 257.

I know 'tis certain, as Mr. P. says, *that there were many Bishops in St. Cyprian's Province*; and therefore I hope his Friend Mr. O. will abate of his Confidence, and retract the next time he writes, what he boldly and falsly asserts, *viz. that all the Ordinations of Presbyters in the Apostles Times, and for 300 Years after Christ, were done by Presbyters without Diocesan Bishops.*

I pass, says Mr. P. *many unproved Assertions*; and so he has a great many proved Assertions: As to Theodoret, which was one of them, I have now (which I thought was needless then) set down the Proof. That St. James was the first fixed Bishop of Jerusalem is agreeable to Scripture, and testified by the universal Consent of the Ancients, particularly by Hegesippus, in Eusebius, E. H. lib. 2. c. 23, who was born in the beginning of the Second Century. The Testimonies for this are so many, that even Blondel owns that the Fathers agree in this (v. Apol. p. 50.) That St. John was Bishop of Ephesus, and governed to the Time of Trajan; see Euseb. lib. 3. c. 1. Iren. adv. Her. l. 3. c. 1. Martyrium S. Timoth. apud Photium Bibliothec. Cod. 254. As to St. Paul's having the Inspection of Corinth, when at a great Distance, 'tis clear from his two Epistles to them. These were all the Assertions, the Proof of which is so commonly known, that I thought it could not be called in question.

But says Mr. P. *his Scheme seems yet to be forming, and therefore 'twill be hard for any Man but himself to piece it together.* What he is pleased to call my Scheme, I thank God, was formed, according to Christ's Institution, by the Apostles, and pra-

ctised

etified by the whole Catholick Church, no other obtaining in any part of the Christian World for 1500 Years together. I am for the old Scheme, which can plead *Vincentius Rule*, *Quod ubique quod semper quod ob omnibus creditum est*; and therefore can't take up with his new one, which, like *Jonah's* Gourd, is but of a Night's growth. But why will it be hard for any Man to piece it together? Mr. P. gives this Reason for it.

Because, I say, "the Apostolical Power, as to its permanent, necessary, and essential Branches was transmitted in *solidum*, as they received it from our blessed Saviour to single Persons in particular Sees; and p. 9. That there were particular and fixed Bounds for a Bishop, in which he exercised his Episcopal Jurisdiction, and the Affair of Ordination, and where there could be but one such Bishop at a time:" And yet, says Mr. P. in the same Page he tells us the Apostles, who were the first Bishops of the Christian Church, exercised their Episcopal Jurisdiction at large and in common, and each had the whole World for his Diocese. Now why mayn't all this be easily pieced together, it being certain that at first the Apostles had the whole World, *τὴν κόσμον ἀπαύλα*, Mark 16. 15. for their Diocese; afterwards indeed, when they thought fit to keep the Churches planted by themselves, no longer in their own hands, they settled them under the Government of a fixed Bishop, such as St. James of Jerusalem, Timothy of Ephesus, Titus of Crete, and the Angels of the seven Churches of Asia, &c.

But Mr. P. queries, Now how can this be, that but one Person can have the Episcopal Jurisdiction in a Church, and yet 12 more, shall have each of them the same Episcopal Jurisdiction in it at the same time. I wonder what sort of Circumstance this is. Why, it was this sort of Circumstance; All the Bishops of the Catholick Church resided at this time in one Place, and govern'd the Church, and managed all Ecclesiastical Affairs in common; and to keep up the Distinction and Preeminence of their Order, according to our Saviour's Institution, added a Twelfth to their Number. But when this One Catholick Church began to spread, and they found their Commission extended to the Gentiles as well as to the Jews, the Faithful at Jerusalem were formed into an Organiz'd Body, under the Episcopal Jurisdiction of St. James, who, as *Hegesippus* tells us, Receiv'd the Administration of that Church from the Apostles, and Govern'd it to the day of his Martyrdom;

tyrdom : Hence the Brethrens conducting *Paul* unto *James*, with whom all the Elders were present, *Act. 21. v. 18.* hence the Messengers, *Gal. 2. 12.* are said to come from *James* : Hence his presiding in the Council at *Jerusalem* when the Apostles and Elders came together to consider whether it was needful to circumcise the Gentile Converts, and oblige them to keep the Law of *Moses* : Hence his Decretory Sentence *κεῖνω ἐγὼ*, that is, as Dr. *Whitby* observes from St. *Chrysostom*, *I with Authority say this, because he (i. e. St. James) had the Government committed to him **.

" We must consider (says the Learned Author of the Defence of Dr. *Stillingfleet's* Unreasonableness of Separation, " p. 212.) that all the Apostles had relation to the whole Church, " and therefore though, being finite Creatures, they could not " be every where at a time, but betook themselves to different places, and planted Churches in several Countries, and " did more peculiarly apply themselves to the Government of " those Churches which they themselves had planted, and ordained Bishops to succeed them, in their Care and Charge ; " yet their Original Right and Power, in relation to the whole " Church, did still remain, which they might reassume, when " they saw Occasion for it ; and which did oblige them to " take care, as far as possibly they could, that the Church of " Christ suffer no Injury by the Heresy or evil Practices of " any of their Collegues ; and though Equals have no Superiority over one another, yet a College has Authority and " Command over any of its Collegues ".

And now Mr. P. may see, how it can be, that but one Person can have the Episcopal Jurisdiction in a Church, when it is formed into an Organiz'd Body. Tho' Twelve more who were Bishops of the Universal Church, and had the Government of it in their own hands, had the same Episcopal Jurisdiction in it, at the same time, before it was Organiz'd, and that after it became a constituted Church, tho' the Apostles were not to be fixed Officers in this Church, they had yet this Relation to it, that their Original Right and Power might be reassumed, when they saw occasion for it ; which Original Right and Power did still remain ; because as St. *Cyprian* says, *there is but one Episcopal Office in the whole Church, part of*

* Πᾶσις ἀποκριθεὶς, ἀλλ' Ἰακώβῳ νομοθετεῖ. Hefychius Presbyter. Hierosolym. apud Phot. Bibliothec. Cod. 275.

which is committed in full Power to every Bishop. And now let Mr. P. distinguish between the Church while the Apostles resided at Jerusalem, and each particular Church under the Government of a fixed Bishop afterwards, and he will find that the Twelve acted as Bishops of the Catholick Church, but St. James as Fixed Bishop of the particular Church of Jerusalem. For the Apostles were never stiled Bishops of Jerusalem, that Character being peculiar to St. James during his Life; and the Apostles consider'd him, even whilst they were actually with him, as Bishop of the whole Body of that Church to whom appertain'd the Throne of it, as Eusebius expresses it, E.H. l. 2. c. 23. and St. James govern'd that Church till the day of his Martyrdom in that Quality; to whom, as Eusebius from Hegesippus informs us, succeeded Simeon the Son of Cleophas, who was ordained Bishop of Jerusalem by a Divine Election.

But says Mr. P. *I had stated the Question very plainly in my Sermon, p. 32.* But he says, p. 10. of his Answer, *It may be more truly stated thus; Whether the Apostolical Power, as to its permanent, necessary, and essential Branches, was not in its nature perpetual and successive, and by them transmitted in solidum, &c.* Now however plainly he has stated the Question, I am sure he has not represented what I stated fairly; for I added, and by them transmitted in solidum to single Persons in particular Sees, and not to a College of Presbyters in the modern Notion; and therefore to,

What he adds, *But if he will take the Advice of a Person he seems to have some Value for, let him hereafter take Questions as they are stated to his hand, and not attempt to state them himself, since he has no Talent at it.* I have this to say, that if his Prejudices had not blinded his Eyesight, he might have seen that the Question was not of my stating, but stated by a Learned Divine, to whom I refer on the Margin, and who had a better Talent at it, than Mr. P. can pretend to; and laid it out to much better use; so that I did take the Question as it was stated to my hand, which I am persuaded is more truly stated, than what he has done; and therefore whatever Value I may seem to have for Mr. P. I don't think myself bound to go astray by his Advice.

Is it not a wise Question, says he, *whether the Apostolical Power, as to its permanent Branches, was not in its own nature perpetual, i. e. permanent.* Now, is it honest Dealing to make such an unjust Comment on my Words? The Question was not, *Whether the Apostolical Power, as to its permanent, necessary,*

cessary and essential Branches was not in its own nature perpetual. But whether it was not in its own nature to be perpetual and successive in the Church, and by them transmitted, *in solidum*, to single Persons in particular Sees, and not to a College of Presbyters, in the modern Notion; and this was to cut off all Retreat to what he calls their *Double Character*, and all Pretences to their being no more than *Presbyters in their ordinary Capacity*; and therefore I think it still *a wise Question*, Whether, with regard to its permanent and essential Nature, not as it was adorn'd with extraordinary and miraculous Advantages, The Apostolical Office was not to be perpetually successive, and transmitted by them, *in solidum*, to single Persons distinct from and superior to meer Presbyters? All this is plainly explained, p. 11. of my Answer: But it would have spoiled his Jest to have fairly represented it.

If it were not as unlawful to follow his Example as it is to *take his Advice*, I might have set down a Sentence of his, thus, *He represents me*, says Mr. P. *as endeavouring to prove the Regularity of Presbyterian Ordination from the Text, which I never attempted, &c.* This I own, by stopping short in imitation of him, is falsely represented; but yet every impartial Reader of his Sermon will find it to be true in *Fact*.

He tells me, *I am very pert in asking him*, " But pray " who are they that say, that Presbyters are the Successors " of such as were ordained by *Timothy* and *Titus*? Such " Prelatists only as Mr. P. and his Brethren, who maintain " that *Timothy* and *Titus* did ordain only Presbyters and no " Bishops. Now, mayn't a Presbyter of the Church, put a Question of this nature to a Dissenting Brother, without being thought *very pert*; or, as he merrily calls it, p. 67. *Def. 2d Part, Insulting*? No, no, *ye take too much upon you*, said *Corah*, when 'twas he and his Company that had taken too much upon themselves.

But let us consider the Case, as to *Titus*, for that of *Timothy* at *Ephesus*, it seems, would have spoil'd his Argument: *My Answerer*, says he, *asserts, there were particular and fixed Bounds for a Bishop, in which he exercised the Affair of Ordination*: And is not this plain from the Practice of the Primitive Church? But *I speak of the Church of Crete*, as govern'd by *Titus*, and left in his possession; because the Scripture leaves it so. *Crete then*, says Mr. P. *was One single Church or Diocese, which was the Bounds of his exercising the Affair of Ordination*: And accordingly he was to ordain them
Elders

Elders in every City. No doubt for some time it was so, tho' the accordingly was not to keep it so. Crete was not only left in his possession, but was also under his Episcopal Care to the Day of his Death; for he died there, according to *Sophronius & Isidore ap. Hieron. de Script. in Tito.* But what then follows? why the Consequence is this; Now, *not to mention*, says he, that two Sorts are not hinted at, how could Titus ordain any Bishops according to the Episcopal Scheme in that one Diocese of Crete? If he only could be Bishop of it, how could he ordain them Bishops? Strange Jargon! But pray, are the Words *Strange Jargon!* enough to confute what I say? I said the Church of Crete was govern'd by Titus, and left in his possession: but I never said that he only, and no other, could be Bishop of the whole Island, or that it was always to continue one Diocese; For it is as certain that new Bishopricks may be erected and taken out of large Dioceses, as new Parishes may be, and daily are, taken out of large Parishes. Originally the whole Power was in Titus, and he had the whole Island for his Diocese; But as Christianity encreased and spread over the whole Island, he was left to Ordain Bishops in as many places as were fit to be formed into constituted Churches; and certainly he could do all this according to the Episcopal Scheme. For to give Mr. P. his Choice, Those Elders whom Titus was left to ordain in every City, were either Bishops, or, in the modern Notion, Presbyters. Now, if they were Presbyters, here's Episcopal Authority over them: If they were Bishops, here's Metropolitcal. Sure this is no strange Jargon! For as the Catholick Church was at first but a single Congregation, yet when it spread far and near, it was formed into Organiz'd Bodies of many Congregations; so, tho' Crete at first was but One Diocese, it became afterwards a Province, wherein were several Bishops, Seven, according to *Mireus his Notitia Episcop. lib. 4. p. 181.* Hence *Eusebius* tells us, that in *Gnossus* of Crete *Pinytus* was a most eminent Bishop, and that *Philip* was the Metropolitan at *Gortyna*, *E.H. lib. 4. cap. 21.*

But what means he by saying, *not to insist that two Sorts are not hinted at.* If it be Arch-Bishops and Bishops, these are not two Sorts. An Arch-Bishop is not a superiour Order to Bishops, nor doth it include any Authority over them, but only a presidency in the same Order, and such advantages of Power in the Government of the Church, as result from a prudent Constitution to preserve the Peace, Order, and Discipline of it. For

all Bishops have originally equal Right and Power in Church Affairs. Tho' a Primacy of Order is granted to some by general Consent, and under the Regulation of Ecclesiastical Canons. They have no proper Superiority and Jurisdiction over Bishops, they being all *ejusdem Sacerdotii & Autoritatis*. The Episcopal Office being but one in the whole Church, part of which is committed in full Power to every Bishop. And certainly the Bishops Power is hinted at, for the Subject of the whole Epistle, and those two to *Timothy* point out his Power and Authority. For not to insist upon Mr. P's Text, if, as I have already observed, the Elders whom *Titus* was left to Ordain in every City be Presbyters, this hints at the Bishop, and if Bishops, it hints at the Arch Bishop or Metropolitan.

But Mr. P. adds, *nor can I see any Difficulty in believing Timothy was sent to Ordain, where there were Presbyters who had the Power of Ordination. For as he was to be the chief Actor in the Work, he was to direct them by his Example, how they were to perform it afterwards when he was gone; and indeed he soon was sent elsewhere.* Now if these Presbyters had the Power of Ordination, they were certainly very Ignorant, if they did not know how to perform it, without *Timothy's* directing them by his Example; who for any thing we can learn from Scripture, never gave them any Directions in the matter. He Ordained amongst them because he was empower'd so to do. But that it was to Direct them how to do it afterwards is no where said. And if Mr. P. thinks he was to Direct them, how comes he to offer no proof for it? does not this look like a plain begging the thing in Question? but if he can't see the Difficulty, I will endeavour to clear his Eye-Sight a little: the Difficulty lies here; how to account why no Directions are given to *Timothy* himself about this; why all the Directions given him by *St. Paul*, do so plainly import according to the Literal and Grammatical Sense of the Words, that he alone was to do it. Mr. P's Text is an unquestionable Evidence that he was to do it, but that the Presbyters were to perform it afterwards, when he was gone, the intimation is invisible; and what tho' *Timothy* soon was sent elsewhere, did this dissolve his Relation to them?

I fancy when Mr. P. gives himself leisure to reflect upon this, he may see the Difficulty. That in fact *Timothy* and *Titus* had Successors, in that wherein they were superior to other Ministers; that the Primitive Bishops believed that they, not meer Presbyters, were the Successors to the Apostles, which

I proved

I proved p. 12. 13, 14. of my Answer ; all this Mr. P. passed over, because, as I suppose, he saw the Difficulty.

But that he may see what Difficulty there is in this Affair, with regard to his own Text, might not a *Congregational* Brother address him thus. "SIR, how came you to tell us, p. 23. of your Sermon, that *the inspired Apostle lodges the Affair of Ordination in Timothy a Person in Office, and so not in the Church or Body of the People*. For is not the Consequence full as good, and so not in meer Presbyters or Body of such : what tho' he was in Office, all Persons in Office have not this lodged in them, for then Deacons might Ordain, for we find such an Office in Scripture, which yet you will not affirm to have been Ordainers. If it be only as you say to *particular Persons in Office*, that Directions are given about constituting Ministers, and that *Timothy and Titus* were the Persons to whom this Affair was recommended ; how came you to be so much off your Guard, as to ask this Question that Crushes your own Practice as much as ours with its Weight. *Why, say you, should nothing of this nature be suggested to the People in the Epistles directed to the Churches, if they were the Conveyors of the Office*. For why should nothing of this nature in three Epistles expressly treating of Ordination ; to two Persons, one of whom as you say, was sent to direct the Presbyters by his Example, how to perform it after he was gone, be suggested to those Presbyters amongst whom he was sent, *if they were the Conveyors of the Office*. You han't you say yet been able to meet with any tolerable Answer to this Objection against that Scheme, meaning ours. But can you make any tolerable Answer to the Objection against your own Scheme. Don't you see that you have pownded your self as well as us ; and when ever you can find any tolerable way to get out, we'll be sure to follow you. All the Directions given to *Timothy and Titus* about Ordination are, for any thing that you have said to the contrary, as pertinently applied to the Church as to the Presbyters ; and we think it full as reasonable to suppose they were to act in the Churches Name, as with you to suppose they were to be only chief Actors, to Direct the Presbyters by their Example, how they were to perform it afterwards ; and we say they were to do this *in actu primo*, in order to direct the Church how to do it afterwards ; and we have very early Instances, much earlier than any that can be brought for Ordination by Presbyters, that the Church did do so. For so *Clement* witnesses in his undoubted Epistle to the Church

“ of *Corinth*. For those who were contending about Rule
 “ and Government in the Church, are advised to stand to
 “ the Determination of the People, and to cry *τὴν ἐκκλησίαν*
 “ *ἡμεῖς καὶ τὸ πλῆθος ποιούμεθα*, and the Learned *Blondell* argues
 “ thence, *potestatem plebis circa sacra*, *Dissert.* 4, c. 8. § 4. And
 “ now, Sir, when you tell us, that if *Christ* design'd to lodge
 “ such a Power in the Body of the People, it will seem strange,
 “ that when he appointed the first Officers of his Church, he
 “ should take such particular care that none of the People should
 “ be present. Why mayn't it seem as strange, that there were
 “ none of the 70. that is, Presbyters present? If the Peo-
 “ ple are excluded from being Ordainers on that account, so
 “ must Presbyters. For, tho' it be certain that there were
 “ none present but the Apostles, who Receiv'd their Power from
 “ Christ, not from the People, because there was no visible
 “ Church in being then; for the Church was yet to be rais-
 “ ed, and these were constituted extraordinary Officers to
 “ plant it. But, after it was raised, we find by *Clement*,
 “ that the Power was in the Body of the People; yea, we
 “ find in Scripture, that These extraordinary Officers, the A-
 “ postles, when they had raised a Church in any Place, they
 “ left the professing Church Members to be indoctrinated and
 “ disciplined by the prescribed Ministry of these Presbyters or
 “ Teaching and Ruling Elders that were of their own vo-
 “ luntary Election and regular Ordination. For mutual co-
 “ venanting and confederating of the Saints in the Fellow-
 “ ship of the Faith, according to the Order of the Gospel,
 “ is that which gives Constitution and Being to a Visible
 “ Church, and the Scripture Presbyterianial Church was such,
 “ and continued such till its first falling away into an un-
 “ polish'd Parochial Church.

“ And now, Sir, whatever you may think of it, your en-
 “ deavouring to refute our Practice from your Text, is a plain
 “ Refutation of your own, and pinches as much as you can
 “ suppose ours to be. We think you did very well to keep
 “ your own Scheme out of sight of your Text; for you see,
 “ your own Arguments against ours, by changing the Term
 “ Church into Presbyters, will to all intents and purposes ruin
 “ and overthrow it. Your useful Ministry a valid one, was
 “ much more to the purpose, and it not only pleased us; but
 “ even, which is strange, the late Bishop *Burnet*, as you tell
 “ us, *Def. p. 20. speaks of it, and recommended it in Terms which*
 “ *you cannot with Decency relate.* What could induce you then

“ to

“ to endeavour to refute our *useful Ministry* by your Text.
 “ For if it may be refuted by Scripture, it cannot be a *Valid*
 “ one : So that whether your *Useful Ministry* was a piece of
 “ Courtship, or *Presbyterian Ordination* proved *Regular*, a fly
 “ Affront to us, Time and better Information will discover.

And now if, without being thought *very pert*, I may ask the Question, pray, What do you think, Sir, of the Congregational Brothers Plea ? Does he not reason as well as you do ? Has he not fairly turn'd the Tables ? If he has, as I am persuaded he has, then you may easily see the Difficulty in believing that *Timothy* was sent to Direct the Presbyters of *Ephesus* how to ordain afterwards when he was gone ; because, for ought we know, he never spake to them about it ; and there is not one Word in his Commission concerning it.

But Mr. P. adds, *He cites a Passage from Dr. Whitby and Mr. Dodwel, against those who deny the Precedency, p. 14. which I have always asserted, whenever I had occasion to mention it, as in my Letters against Dr. Wells, and my Vindication against Dr. Nicols.* Now all the Precedency that he asserts, is that of *Primi inter Pares*, which is as far from the Design of the Passage cited by me, as Mr. P.'s vouching, in his Vindication against Dr. Nicols, *St. Jerom*, for his pretended Precedency, is from Truth. For *Jerom* not only excepts Ordination, as a thing that Presbyters could not do, but he expressly says, *Ut sciamus Traditiones Apostolicas sumptas de Veteri Testamento, Quod Aaron & filii ejus atque Levitæ in Templo fuerunt, hoc sibi Episcopi & Presbyteri atque Diaconi vendicent in Ecclesia*, Ep. ad Evagr. Which shews that Bishops were not only Superiour in Precedency and Dignity, but also in Office and Authority.

I make Evangelists, says Mr. P. *superior to common and ordinary Ministers.* Their Superiority I place not in their being of a Different Order ; for I prove that the Apostles themselves were in that respect no more than Presbyters, But I consider them as superior in Gifts. If bare saying be proving, Mr. P. has indeed proved the Apostles to be no more than Presbyters. But those who believe that the Plenitude of the Apostolical Power was transmitted by them to single Persons superior to Presbyters, can't take up with such Proofs. If Gifts made the Superiority, common and ordinary Ministers had Gifts also, and these the same with Evangelists ; and therefore as to me, Mr. P. was certainly in the right, when he adds, *But this he will not allow.* For which I give this Reason, “ Because we
 “ find

" find no such Office of an Evangelist instituted, distinct from
 " that of an Apostle, Presbyter, or Deacon, but that it was
 " a common Designation to all who were the first Planters
 " of the Gospel. This was obvious enough, and therefore

I wonder that Mr. P. should say, *his chief Argument is that Philip the Deacon is stiled an Evangelist*, when he knows that I insisted upon this, that to be an Evangelist is agreeable to all the Subordinations of the Christian Hierarchy; and therefore I instanced, p. 21. That St. Mark was Bishop of Alexandria and Evangelist, St. Luke a Presbyter and Evangelist, Philip both Deacon and Evangelist. The two first he passes over, but as to Philip he adds,

What reason can there be to think, that tho' Philip was a Deacon at first, he was never advanced? Doubtless he had used the Office well, and therefore, according to the Apostles Rule, had purchased to himself a good Degree. But what if he was advanced; the Office of an Evangelist was clearly consistent with this Advancement. For Rulers and Bishops, that greater Dignity in the Church of God; as Mr. P. says Dr. Hammond explains it, might be and were Evangelists; For so the Doctor tells us in his Notes on Ephes. 4. 11. As he that from a Deacon, says the Dr. is made a Bishop, hath all the Powers that belonged to a Deacon still continued to him, and the addition of so much more. So he that is an Evangelist, if he be farther invested with Power of Ordination, may still remain an Evangelist,—the Word Evangelist—is indifferently used, whether he have the Power of Deacon only, as Philip, or more, as of Timothy and Mark.

Therefore what signifies it, as Mr. P. tells me, that Dr. Whitby makes it no less than 26 Years after his having been ordained Deacon, that Philip is called an Evangelist; For, let any Man not only judge, whether he was not in that time raised higher; but let him also take it for granted that he was, yet this is certain from Acts 8. that he was as much an Evangelist Twenty Six Years before, according to Dr. Whitby's Computation, as he was when we find him so called, Acts 21. 8. For whatever reason there is to believe he was no longer a Deacon, there is good reason from Scripture, to believe he was an Evangelist whilst he was a Deacon; and if he was advanced when we find him residing at Cesarea, this is no Argument for his being made an Evangelist at that time; Because the Scripture tells us, that when he was a Deacon, he performed that Office, and preached in all the

Cities

Cities till he came to Cesarea; where 'tis probable he was advanced to a higher Dignity in the Church, which might be the reason why he did not return to Jerusalem again, to discharge the Office of a Deacon.

As to his Opinion of the Presbyter of the Church of England, his Answerer, who, says Mr. P. I dare say, would not have been kept a Tenth part of the time in that Office. I can only tell him, that he is as much mistaken here, as he is about Philip. For the Presbyter was a little more than a Tenth part of the time kept in that Office, and had no reason to complain of it.

His other Argument, says Mr. P. is, that Evangelists are left out, 1 Cor. 12. 28. Now, 'tis a little peculiar to such as assume the Power of dictating to make the same Argument to be for or against them, as they please. Well, but how does he prove this to be my Case? I argued, says Mr. P. from their being mention'd, and set before Pastors and Teachers, Eph. 4. 11. But in that place the mentioning of them in that order signifies nothing with him; and yet in 1 Cor. 12. 28. the not mentioning them at all, which is only a Negative Argument, must be a clear Proof, they were not certainly superior to Pastors. Now it is not, the not mentioning of them at all, that I insisted on for the whole Proof, but because, as Dr. Whitby on the place observes, *they of the Teachers who preached the Gospel to them who had not heard it, were called Evangelists; and that to be an Evangelist is agreeable to all the Subordinations of the Christian Hierarchy. It was a common Appellation to all who preached the Gospel; and this seems to be the Reason that it is not set down here.*

But such a positive Text, says Mr. P. as mine, is worth a Thousand of his negative ones. I suppose he means that 'tis a better Proof; for, with regard to Scripture, it sounds strangely to say, one Text is worth a Thousand of other Texts. But, without comparing the Worth of the Texts, I say my Text is as positive as his, if not more; for there is, *first*, *secondly*, and *thirdly* in my Text, which orderly Enumeration is not in his; so that here is a positive Instance, that Evangelists, as such, are not superior to Pastors and Teachers; for Teachers in my Text are in the very Rank of Evangelists in his Text, and this Order is repeated in the following Verse, and consequently Evangelists, as such, are not superior to them, especially if Mr. P's own Argument be any proof that the Order in which they are set down, Ephes. 4. 11. sufficiently evidences this. Sermon. p. 33. *W^e*

We don't know, says he, what reason the Apostle had for leaving them out. I could perhaps guess, but no Man can at this distance speak with Assurance, since there might be Twenty things that might have been a reason for it. But what need is there for guessing, when the reason is so plain, that to be an Evangelist is agreeable to all the Subordinations of the Christian Hierarchy. There can none of his Twenty Things, be better than this true Reason, that we find it was so in Fact.

But, says he, if such a Negative Argument be of any Strength, how will he account for Timothy's Ordaining Persons of three several Orders, when the Apostle mentions no more than two. Now I can very well account for this, tho' I can't account for his Mistake, that the Apostle mentions no more than Two Orders. For here is Timothy himself, a Man in the highest Order of the Three, receiving Instructions not only how to Ordain Presbyters and Deacons, but to commit the Things he had heard of St. Paul to Faithful Men who shall be able to teach others also. Appoint thou them, says Dr. Hammond, as Bishops of the several Churches under thee; and this seems agreeable to the general Sense of the Ancients, who assert that Timothy was a Metropolitan, ordained and installed Bishop of the Metropolis of the Ephesians by St. Paul, says the anonymous Author of his Life in Photius, Num. 254. 'Tis manifest that Timothy was intrusted with a Church, or rather with a whole Nation, that of Asia, says St. Chrysostom, Homil. 15. in 1 Tim. 5. 19. Hence 'tis observed in the Synopsis, Hinc videmus Timotheum non Episcopi tantum sed & Metropolitæ functum officio non minus quam Titum nam docere erat ὅτι ἡγεμὼν, οὐσιαστικῶν, ἀρχιερέων. ut prius, Episcoporum, ut posterius, per eminentiam eos vocavit Ecclesia.

Mr. P. passes over two or three Pages together, and observes that p. 20. of my Answer, I cavil with him for imposing upon his Hearers with the Ambiguity of the Word Presbyters, which, says he, is the most unreasonable thing in the World; for I prove that the Apostles might be more than one in a Church, which is the certain Notion of Presbyters. But did he not say, that Presbyters or Bishops are the same in Scripture, our Adversaries themselves many of them being Judges. Why then did he not tell his Hearers in what sense his Adversaries allow them to be the same? Do they say that the Identity of Names infer an Identity of Office: Here lies the Ambiguity; and what if it be the certain Notion of Presbyters to be more than one in a Church, is it not likewise the

Notion

Notion of Deacons? And if, as he pretends, the Apostles might be more than one in the Church, will not this as much prove them to be Deacons, if he has a mind to it. That the Apostles might be, and were more than One in the Catholick Church I grant: But this can never prove them Presbyters; for Bishops in the modern Notion are such: But that the Apostles might be, and were, more than One, as the Fixed Pastors of a particular constituted Church, I deny; neither has he given yet the least Proof for it.

As to what he adds, *and tho' he (says Mr. P.) finds so much fault with me, yet he manifestly runs into the Crime he charges me with, and plays with the Ambiguity of the Word Apostles, as used by the Ancients.* Now it had been fair to have given an Instance; for I can't find that I have run into that Crime; I am sure I have drawn no Argument from the Ambiguity of the Word *Apostles*, as used by the Ancients; I maintain that the Plenitude of the ordinary and standing Apostolical Power and Authority was transmitted to single Persons, to whom the Name of Bishops was appropriated, after the Decease of the Blessed Apostles, that such were always superior to and distinct from meer Presbyters. But I must wait till I am better informed, to know wherein I play with the Ambiguity of the Word.

Let any Man, says he, read the Passage I have cited from Jerom, Vind. F. D. p. 224. and he will see how loosely they applied the Word. But what's that to me, or to the Point in debate? The Names are long ago appropriated, and I don't pretend, as his Party does, to draw an Argument from the Identity of Names to the Identity of Offices. I find *Andronicus* and *Junia* called *ἀποστολοι ἐν τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις*, Rom. 16. 7. So *Epaphroditus*, *ὁ μὲν ἦν Ἀπόστολος*, Philip. 2. 25. and so are *Titus* and *Timothy*, 2 Cor. 8. 22, 23. What then if *several of the Ancients* stiled *Philip* an *Apostle*, how does Mr. P. know, that I will vouch for it that he was but a *Deacon*, always. That he was once a *Deacon*, and at the same time an *Evangelist*, I have Scripture to vouch for it: But that he was always so, I don't pretend to vouch it. As to *Cottelerius* Notes on the *Apostolical Constitutions*, which he refers to for this, is it not very plain from thence, that tho' they call *Philip* an *Apostle*, lib. 6. c. 7. as, *Cotelerius* says, many of the Fathers gave this Name to *Apostolical Men*, yet do they not expressly call him, lib. ult. cap. ult. *Philip the Deacon*. As to *Gregorius Nyssenus*, who, Mr. P. says, would not have any one think that *Stephen*,

phen, who certainly was no more than a Deacon, was inferior in Honour to the Apostles. Does not Gregorius plainly say that he was no more than a Deacon? He had the Honour to be the Proto-Martyr for Christianity; and all that Gregory says, is that he would not have any Body think the less of him, for being but a Deacon; for, says he, Paul owns himself a Minister of the Mysteries, 1 Cor. 4. 1. Now whatever Honour he thought him worthy of, yet since Gregorius does not pretend to say that Stephen was not inferior in Office to the Apostles, * all this is nothing to the purpose, it only serves to shew Mr. P's Reading; and at the same time his great Disregard to the Fathers, which all Innovators want to have out of the way, that they may fall foul, as one expresses it, upon the unguarded Letter of Scripture: Accordingly Mr. P. adds, So little Stress is be laid on them, especially when the Case is plain in Scripture. Now when the Case is plain in Scripture, there is no need to have recourse to them. But as to Presbyterian Ordination, which is the Case at present, I am persuaded, that as it cannot be made out without wresting the Scripture, so, it being a Question of Fact, the Fathers are the most proper Judges of it; who can best tell whether it was ever practised in the Primitive Church. But Mr. P. is well aware, what the constant uninterrupted Practice of the Catholick Church hath been as to this: *Hinc illa Lachryma.*

I alledg'd, says Mr. P. this Proof of our Notion, " And certainly, if the Apostles themselves were not of such an Order, as our Modern Bishops are pretended to be, neither could the Evangelists be of it. Now, had Christ design'd his Apostles should be Officers according to the Episcopal Scheme, he ought to have appointed each of them to preside over some one Church; for 'tis the standing Maxim of that Scheme, *There can be but One Bishop in One Church*: Whereas no less than Eleven, to whom presently after Christ's Ascension a Twelfth was added, were at first constituted, and for some time remain'd the Rulers and Governors of the Church, having all an equal Power and Authority. So that the Apostles were evidently in their Ordinary Capacity, Presbyters, that is such kind of Officers, as might be more than one in one Church ". Here the Controversy, says he, is brought to a short Issue, and yet my Answerer re-

* Vid. *Encorp. in Stephanum*, Vol. III. p 356.

turns not an Answer to any part of the Argument, but runs out into a wild Discourse quite foreign to the matter in hand. Now 'tis a little peculiar to such as assume the Power of Misrepresenting, to make an Answerer speak and act as they please. Did I not plainly prove, that the Ancients Believ'd that Bishops, not Presbyters, were the proper Successors of the Apostles, and therefore I made this Answer to the first part of his Argument, *Certainly the Apostles were of such an Order as our Modern Bishops are pretended to be; but Evangelists were consistent with any of the Three Orders*, p. 22. Now, tho' he takes no Notice of this, it shews that I have return'd something of an Answer to one part of the Argument, tho' he was pleas'd to say I had not to any Part.

And as to the next Sentence, *Now had Christ design'd, &c.* I return'd this Answer, That the two Orders of Gospel Ministers instituted by Christ, discover, that he design'd his Apostles should be Officers according to the Episcopal Scheme; so that the Apostles, in their ordinary Capacity, were Bishops, as the Seventy were Presbyters; For there was a manifest Imparity between them and the Seventy; and the Apostles thought themselves bound to keep it up, by adding a 12th to their Number, and appointing him from one of the Seventy to be of the Superior Order of an Apostle, or Bishop in the Modern Notion. Now, was this, and a great deal more, which may be seen in my Answer, no Answer to any part of the Argument? An Answer certainly it was, the Strength of which is to be judged by the Reader. But to say I ran out into a wild Discourse, quite foreign to the matter in hand, argues more Prejudice than Diligence.

But it seems, what I took to be the most trifling, is the most valuable Part of the Argument, with him. The Twelve Apostles, for some time, remained at Jerusalem the Rulers and Governors of the Church, having all an equal Power and Authority, and so they were afterwards to the Day of their Death, the Rulers and Governors of the Church; but it does not follow that therefore they were evidently in their ordinary Capacity Presbyters: For all Bishops now are Rulers and Governors of the Church, having all an equal Power and Authority; but the Episcopal Scheme does not therefore make them Presbyters: For, according to that Scheme, Bishops are such Officers as are more than One in the One Catholick Church, and Presbyters such as are more than One in a particular constituted Church, under the fixed and peculiar Charge of a Bishop, their Ruler

and Governour. For, as I then reply'd, the Apostles were Rulers and Governours of the Church not only before but after their appointing St. James to be fixed Bishop of Jerusalem, and to preside for term of Life: He was the first Bishop of the first constituted Church, according to the Episcopal Scheme. Here then, let the Controversy be brought to a *short Issue*, I am ready to join in it, and to put a stop to Mr. P's imaginary Triumph.

And now, since Mr. P. is such a Writer of Controversy, that scarce one Argument of any Adversary against his way of thinking, hath ever yet appeared to him good and convincing. That his usual way (as in Dr. Wells and Dr. Hole's Case) is to invalidate their Arguments by a vain Surmise of their not understanding the Controversy. It mayn't be amiss to premise, that he himself does not, or will not understand the Scheme which he so zealously rejects. In answer to the Ingenious Examiner of his *Moral and Rational Conduct*, p. 42. Def. Part 2d. who tells him, that *it doth not appear, nor is it probable, that the Apostles ever had the Government of the Church of Jerusalem with equal Power, as that was a particular Church, distinct from the Universal*. To this,

He queries, 1. *Whether the Church of Jerusalem was not a particular Church? If it was, says he, sure that is enough for my purpose; and we have therein a Platform for the Government of other particular Churches, when they came to be formed.* Now, what Platform must this be then, unless we have Twelve Officers of a superior Office, Power, and Authority, to Seventy Presbyters, and Seven Deacons; for 'tis plain, by adding a Twelfth to their Number, that they were of a distinct Office. Besides, had not the same Church, when it was but a particular Congregation, the same Officers in it? Does it therefore follow, that we have *therein a Platform for the Government of other particular Congregations, when they came to be formed?* If this does not follow, how can it be enough for his purpose, that the first Christian Church was a particular Church, *i. e.* one Church. For the whole Catholick Church did subsist in that one particular Church; and that Church first planted by the Apostles in Jerusalem, is that one Church, which was afterwards spread over all the World; for when the Apostles planted Churches in other Cities, Countries, and Provinces, they did not erect new distinct independent Churches, but only enlarged that one Church of Christ, and added new Members to it. (Vid. *Vindic. of the Def. of Dr. Stillingfleet*, p. 24.)

Mr. P's great Mistake lies here, that he seems to have no true Notion of the *One Church of Christ*; for, as the Learned Author of the *Vindication*, above quoted, observes, p. 13. from St. Cyprian, *The Catholick Church, though it consists of all particular Churches which are contained in it, yet is not a meer arbitrary Combination and Confederacy of particular Churches, but is the Root and Foundation of Unity, and in order of Nature antecedent to particular Churches, as the Sun is before its Beams, and the Root before its Branches, and the Fountain before the Rivers that flow from it.* But Mr. P. will have the Church of *Jerusalem* to be a particular Church antecedent to the Catholick Church, i. e. he will have it to be an entire and complete Church, an Organiz'd Body by it self, without any Respect to its being the whole Catholick Church. For his 2d Query runs thus,

Did that Circumstance, of being the Universal Church, make any Difference in the Case of the particular Church of Jerusalem from other particular Churches? Yes, surely, if there be any Difference between the Root and the Branches; for a Church which is one by Institution, must begin in one, and enlarge it self by receiving others into the Unity of the same Body, which, for the Convenience of Worship and Discipline, may form themselves into distinct, but not separate Church-Societies. (Vid. *Vindicat.* p. 27.) But, says Mr. P. "What is meant by its being the *Universal Church*, but this, that there were then no other Churches set up? I answer, that 'tis very absurd to think that it was the Catholick or Universal Church, because of this; for the Catholicism of the Church does not consist merely in its actual Extent, but in its intrinsic Nature, which is always the same, be there many or few particular Churches set up; for, as the Learned Author of the *Vindication* above-mention'd observes, "The Church which is now spread all the World over, is but that One Church still which began at *Jerusalem*; and therefore the Church at *Jerusalem*, while but One single Congregation, was the Catholick Church in its Root and Fountain, and Principle of Unity. And whereas Mr. P. adds, *Did the planting another Church, in another place, make any Alteration in the Case of the particular Church of Jerusalem?* I answer, It made no other Alteration but this, that the same One Church became thereby more Catholick and Universal, with respect to its Extent, than it was at first; But the Nature of the Church was still the same, each particular Church that was planted, being a Member of the One Catholick

tholick Church, which can be but One, because Christ is but One, and One Christ can be but One Head, and One Head can have but One Body.

But (3.) says Mr. P. *If this Aristocratical Government was fix'd in the Church of Jerusalem, when it was the Universal Church, there is the more reason to think that the same Government was to be fix'd in all other particular Churches, of which the Universal Church was to be constituted.* Now there are two very great Mistakes in this one Paragraph; the first, that the Government fix'd in the Church of Jerusalem when it was the Catholick and Universal Church, was *Aristocratical*: For the Twelve, and all the other Governours of it, in whom the supreme Power and Authority was lodg'd, had each of them, tho' all equal, an inherent Power and Authority, and the Government was in each of them distinct, and accordingly they kept the Government of the Churches planted by themselves in their own hands, till they thought fit to form them into organiz'd Bodies, with Governours or fixed Bishops of their own Appointment, such as *Timothy* and *Titus*, &c. whereas, in an *Aristocracy*, every individual Senator, tho' he hath equal Power, yet the Government is not in any of those Distinct, but in the whole Senate.

The second Error is as great as the first; for unless he resolves to follow Mr. L**eb**'s senseless Conceit, how comes he to talk of all other particular Churches of which *the Universal Church was to be constituted*; for particular Churches are made by the Encrease and Propagation of the Catholick Church, not the Catholick Church by the Propagation of particular Churches: For the Church at that time could not be called *Catholick and Universal*, as it signifies the Christian Church diffused and propagated in all Parts of the World, before it was so diffused and propagated; nor, as he mistakes it, because *there were no other Churches set up*. But it was the Catholick Church as the Root and Fountain of Unity, and consequently the Catholick Church consider'd as such, *was in order of Nature antecedent to particular Churches*. For as the Learned Author of the *Vindication* above mentioned expresses it, pag. 26. "*Christ, in the Institution of his Church, designed but One Church all the World over, which we call the Catholick Church: This Catholick Church must of necessity have a Beginning somewhere, as de facto it had at Jerusalem; wherever this Beginning is, there is the Root and Fountain of Catholick Unity; because all other Christians and Churches which after-*"

wards

“wards embrace the Christian Faith, are added to this Church,
 “and received into the Unity of this One Body; and it is
 “impossible that any Man should be a Christian, or any So-
 “ciety of Men a Christian Church, who are not receiv'd in-
 “to the Unity of this Church, NOT CONSIDER'D AS
 “SUCH A PARTICULAR CHURCH, but as the Begin-
 “ning of the Catholick Church; and thus all particular Churches
 “are united to one another, and by virtue of this Catholick
 “Union, are One Catholick Church.

Now this will clearly discover, that 'tis not the *Examiner*, but Mr. P. himself, who is mistaken, in his Notion of the Catholick Church, especially when he adds, *For the Church of Jerusalem ceased to be the Universal Church, as soon as any Christian Church was set up in any other Place.* On the contrary, the One Catholick Church which began at *Jerusalem*, became more universal with regard to its Extent, as soon as any Christian Church was set up in any other Place; because these Churches were added to this Church, and received into the Unity of this *One Body*. The Catholick Church did once subsist in one particular Congregation; and as it did not cease to be the Universal Church, but was that One Church still, when more particular Congregations were set up at *Jerusalem*, so it did not cease to be the One Catholick and Universal Church when it was enlarged into many particular Churches, each of which were Members of that One Church, which had its Beginning at *Jerusalem*; all particular Christians, all particular Churches were received into the Unity of this Church, not consider'd as One particular Church, which is Mr. P's great Mistake, but as the Beginning of the Catholick Church. For, *the most common Reason assigned, both by Ancient and Modern Divines, why the Church is called Catholick and Universal, is, not because it is an universal Notion, made by a mental Abstraction from Particulars, but because it diffuses it self all the World over, and propagates it self into all Parts, without Division or Multiplication into new distinct Churches, but continuing one and the same Church from the beginning, fills the World with Christians living in this one Communion and Society.* (Vid. *Vindic. of the Def. of Dr. Stillingfleet*, p. 19.)

As to the Church which was planted at Samaria, before the Apostles left their Residence at *Jerusalem*, I am at a loss to know what Service this Instance can do Mr. P. Here were Christians, by the Ministry of *Philip the Deacon*, added to the Church, and received into the Unity of that *One Body* of which the Apostles were Rulers. For as yet the Church planted at
 Samaria

Samaria was no particular Organiz'd Church, consider'd as a Distinct Member of the One Catholick Church : And Mr. P. may persuade himself, that 'tis granted the Apostles continued the Rulers of that Church as our Lord left them, not only while they remain'd together in it, but also while they lived at a Distance in it. For they were the Rulers, tho' not the only Rulers of the One Catholick Church to the Day of their Death.

Let him try, says Mr. P. if he can assign the least Probability of their settling St. James the Bishop or President of Jerusalem before they resolv'd to disperse themselves thro' the World. Now I think I have already, from Scripture, demonstrated the Probability of this, p. 14. to which I refer the Reader, and shall only add what the Learned Bishop of Oxford observes (p. 90. chap. 3. Disc. of Church Government.) Tho' the Scriptures do not expressly mention his (i. e. St. James's) Promotion, they give us many Proofs of his being the Head of the Church of Jerusalem, after the Apostles began to leave that Place. It is remarkable, says he, that when in the first Five Chapters of the ACTS, Peter is constantly spoken of as the chief Apostle, and the principal Person in the Church of Jerusalem, there is nothing after that said of him, which implies that Character ; and from the 12th Chapter of that Book, which is the first place wherein James is mentioned with any Character of Distinction, he is constantly described, as the chief Person at Jerusalem, even when Peter was present.

But notwithstanding of all this, Mr. P. makes this Reply to the Learned Examiner, when he tells him, *We find the Church of Jerusalem soon had its single Bishop, according to such Accounts as are well worthy our Acceptation.* " For my own part, says " Mr. P. I absolutely deny (he will bear with my Conduct) " that the Church of Jerusalem had any otherwise a single Bishop, after the spreading of Christianity, than it always had " from the first Foundation. Now, whatever his prejudiced Admirers may do, I am sure no impartial Reader can bear with the Conduct of a Writer, who absolutely denies a Fact, that's not only agreeable to Scripture, but testified by the universal Consent of the Ancients, who all affirm, that the Church of Jerusalem was under the particular Care and Government of St. James, as the fixed Bishop of the same.

St. Peter, says Mr. P. by our Lord's Institution, was as much the Bishop of Jerusalem before the spreading of Christianity, as St. James was afterwards. No doubt he was as much the Bishop of the One Catholick Church which began at Jerusalem, before

before and after the spreading of Christianity, as St. James was afterwards. But that he was as much the fixed Bishop of *Jerusalem*, when the One Catholick Church spread out into more Branches, is flying in the face of unexceptionable Evidence, and denying a manifest Truth.

But I see the Cause of this Mistake; he takes the particular Church at *Jerusalem*, which was the Beginning of the Catholick Church in its Root and Fountain, to be from the Beginning a distinct Member and constituted Part of the One Catholick Church; not considering, that this is not only to make a particular Church antecedent to the Catholick Church, which is as absurd as to make Branches before the Root, or Rivers before the Fountain; but it is a misrepresenting of the Difference between the Church at its first planting, and afterwards; which Difference, says the Learned Author of the *Vindication*, p. 22 is like the Difference between a Child new born, and when he is come to his full Growth and Stature; he is the same Person still, but increased in all Parts. without dividing one Member from another, or multiplying it self INTO MORE BODIES. But Mr. P. will have every particular Church to be a new Body, like to, but distinct in all respects from, the first; which is making Christ to have more than One Church and One Body.

And now I must beg the Learned Examiner's pardon for breaking in upon his Province. I thought my self obliged to take notice of Mr. P's Queries, to prevent, as he says, abundance of vain Jangling, and to let the World see how pertinently the Compliment he makes to Dr. Wells might be return'd, and Who, says Mr. P. I will be now free to say, did not understand our Controversy; wherein I give the late Bishop of Sarum's Judgment. For not only the late Bishop of Sarum's Judgment, but the Judgment of all the Bishops, except ONE, that ever dip't into this Controversy, may be brought against his way of thinking; for he is either a Stranger to, or conceals his Knowledge of this Point. And now having made my way clear, I come to encounter his mighty Demonstration.

The Reader will excuse me, says he, if I put the Argument into form, that I may force him, if he would speak to the purpose, to tell what he Denies, and what he Grants. Now, the weakest Syllogism that is, and I think there can be few weaker than what follows, will do as much, if any Man resolves to answer Categorically. The Syllogism is this, Those Officers who might be more than one in one single Church, were not Bishops but Presbyters. The Apostles were Officers who might be more

than one in one single Church ; Therefore the Apostles were not Bishops but Presbyters. In Answer to which,

First then, I deny the Major ; For as he represents it, 'tis not the *standing Maxim of the Episcopal Scheme*. For as those Officers, who might be more than One in One single Church, were not Bishops, so neither were they all Presbyters ; because, according to the *Episcopal Scheme*, Deacons also were such Officers as might be more than One in One single Church. Another great Mistake in the Major is this, that he does not consider, that according to the *standing Maxim of the Episcopal Scheme*, those Officers only who took upon them the fixed and peculiar Charge of One single constituted Church in which they were to preside for term of Life, were Bishops not Presbyters, and were no more than One. But, if in this Sense he understands Officers in his Major ; then, granting the Major, I deny the Minor : For 'tis absolutely false, that the Twelve Apostles were Officers of the One single Church of *Jerusalem* in this Sense.

The Minor only needs Proof, says Mr. P. and is thus proved : Those Officers who might be more than One in the single Church of *Jerusalem*, might be more than One in One single Church. The Apostles were Officers who might be more than One in the Church of *Jerusalem* ; therefore the Apostles were Officers who might be more than One in One single Church. I deny the Minor ; For the Apostles were not such Officers as might be more than One to rule and preside for term of Life in the single Church of *Jerusalem*, consider'd as a distinct Member of the One Catholick Church ; they resided in *Jerusalem* as Rulers and Governours of the Holy Catholick Church, not fixed Governours of the single constituted Church of *Jerusalem*, the Care and Government of which, when it was Organiz'd, they committed to St. James, and before that, there was not One single constituted Church, in the whole Catholick Church, for them to be in. For particular Churches, as one observes, are made by the Encrease and Propagation of the Catholick Church, not the Catholick Church by the Propagation of particular Churches.

And therefore, as to the Reason of his Major, I grant that the Church of *Jerusalem* was One single Church after it was Organiz'd. But I deny that the Apostles were fixed Officers in the One single constituted Church of *Jerusalem*. And as to the Reasons of his Minor, I Grant that there were actually Twelve Apostles residing at *Jerusalem* as Rulers and Governours of the Catholick Church ; but I Deny that they were fixed Officers of the One single constituted Church of *Jerusalem*.

Jerusalem. I Grant that the One single Church of *Jerusalem* was the first constituted Church, and as such, the first distinct Member, and part of the One Catholick Church which began at *Jerusalem*; but I deny that it was constituted such *immediately by our Lord himself*. The Extent of the Apostles Commission shews us plainly, that they were not to be fixed Officers of the One single Church of *Jerusalem*. Our Saviour laid a Foundation for the Imparity of Church-Officers; and the Apostles, when they gather'd Churches, and thought fit to keep the Government no longer in their own Hands, formed them into constituted Churches, after the *Model and Pattern* of the first constituted Church of *Jerusalem*, which I grant to be *certainly the best*, as it was the *first Christian Constituted Church*.

But the One Catholick Church is the same now as it was before this One single Church of *Jerusalem* was constituted, only with this Difference, That the Apostles, that is, all the Bishops and Rulers of the Church resided then at one Place, and govern'd the Church jointly: But now the Bishops live singly at a Distance, yet they have all the same Relation to the Whole Church; because *there is but One Episcopacy in the Whole Church, part of which is committed in full Power to every Bishop*.

This, says Mr. P. brings the Controversy into a narrow Compass, and will prevent abundance of vain Jangling. I wish it would, for then I should be in hopes to see him soon ferretted out of all his Retreats, and the very Foundations of his Cause rooted up. For his fine *Argument* will equally serve to prove the Three Hundred and Eighteen Bishops of the first General Council, supposing it to have held Eighteen Years, to have been but Presbyters, not Bishops; it being certain, that those Rulers were all of them Officers of the same One Church, and had the same Relation to the Church of Nice; that the Apostles had to the One single Church of *Jerusalem*; and therefore, *Those Officers who might be more than One in One single Church were not Bishops but Presbyters*. The Fathers of the first General Council were such; Ergo,

" I use the Term Bishops and Presbyters, according to the Episcopal
 " *Dialect*. The Major, in my Argument, is the standing Maxim of
 " their Scheme; and so I take it for granted. The Minor only
 " needs Proof, and is thus proved: *Those Officers who might be*
 " *more than One in the Church of Nice, might be more than One*
 " *in One single Church*. The Fathers of the first General Council,
 " *were Officers who might be more than One in the Church of*

“ Nice ; Therefore the Fathers of the first General Council were
 “ Officers who might be more than One in One single Church.
 “ The reason of the Major is plain, viz. That the Church of
 “ Nice was One single Church ; and the reason of the Minor
 “ is as plain, viz. That there were actually Three Hundred
 “ and Eighteen Fathers, or at least near Three Hundred in
 “ the Church of Nice. I have turned it in my Thoughts
 “ often, and have set my self to devise what Reply could be
 “ made to it ; and I must profess, I always found my self as
 “ much at a loss for any as this Writer is.

I have not mention'd this, says Mr. P. so much for the sake
 of my Answerer, who, I see, has nothing to say to it, as for
 other Learned Men of the Party, from whom I should be glad
 if he would procure me an Answer to the purpose. Now if he will
 be pleased to accept of the Answer I think it deserves, it is
 at his service : I am not much concern'd whether he will be
 glad of it or no. I saw the Flaws of his Argument at first
 reading, and therefore wanted not the Help of any Learned
 Friend to do Justice to it.

As for what he adds, that he had turn'd it in his own
 Thoughts often, and set himself to devise what Reply could be
 made to it, and must profess, says he, I always found my self as
 much at a loss for any as this Writer is ; it only shews his
 Over-Fondness for it, especially when he concludes, I am much
 mistaken if some of Euclid's Propositions are more clearly de-
 monstrated. For, as the Writer was at no loss for an Answer
 to it, so 'tis so far from coming up to a Demonstration, that
 the Conclusions of his Syllogisms seem to scorn any Acquain-
 tance with their Premises, which is no great sign of their ha-
 ving an Air of Mathematicks.

But to proceed. I think, says he, My Reasons are as strong,
 at least, against Timothy's being at Ephesus, when the second
 Epistle was wrote to him, as any can be alledg'd for it. That
 Onesiphorus was an Ephesian is not proved, or that Priscilla
 and Aquila, tho' they staid some time at Ephesus, after they were
 driven from Rome, fixed their Residence there, is but a Pro-
 bability, and so must be weigh'd with probable Evidences on
 the other side. Now if his Reasons had been as strong as he
 supposes them, yet they are nothing to the purpose ; for what,
 as I told him, if Timothy was absent at this time, it does not
 therefore follow that the Right of Ordination belong'd to the
 Ephesian Presbyters, since his Absence did not necessarily dis-
 solve his Relation to them. But this he has nothing to say
 to;

to, nor to pag. 24, 25. where I charge him with giving up Ruling Elders, and consequently the *Divine Right* of Presbytery. But as to *Onesiphorus*, it may as easily be proved, that he was an *Ephesian*, as that Mr. P. is at present an *Exonian*; for he had his Household at *Ephesus*, 2 *Tim.* 1. 18. And whether *Priscilla* and *Aquila* fixed their Residence there, is not the Point, they were then at *Ephesus*; for *Timothy* is desired to salute them, and the Household of *Onesiphorus*, Chap. 4. 19.

I said, says Mr. P. I never find in the whole New Testament any Ordination, which was performed by a single Person. He alledges the Ordination of *Titus*, which is not mention'd there. Paul calls him Son, and so he does *Timothy*; and therefore the Ordination of the Latter may determine the Nature of the Former. Let it then; For tho' it be plainly implied, Chap. 1. 5. that the Ordination of *Titus* was performed by St. Paul only, yet I will stand to that Determination.

'Tis not certain, says Mr. P. the Apostle had a hand in *Timothy's* Ordination; because, 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. he may speak of Giving the Holy Ghost, which was never done by any but the Apostles, except *Ananias*, by a special Command: And the Holy Ghost was sometimes Given before Ordination, as appears by the Seven Deacons. Now I hope to make it appear, that 'tis most certain, the Apostle had a hand in *Timothy's* Ordination, Mr. P. being the single Person, for what I know, that ever doubted it. I am sure *Calvin*, on the Place, makes no doubt of it, and all the ancient Commentators assert it; the thing it self being clear from Scripture. For granting it to be the Gift of the Holy Ghost, 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. yet it was conferr'd upon *Timothy* at his Ordination; For the *Charisma*, or Spiritual Gift, says Dr. *Whitby*, here mention'd (*viz.* 1 *Tim.* 4. 14) is expressly said to be Given by the laying on of the Hands of St. Paul, 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. The Presbytery also laid their Hands upon him; but the *χάρισμα*, or Gift here mentioned being that of the Holy Ghost, was usually conferr'd by the laying on of the Hands of an Apostle. Being then that it is the same Gift in both Places, being it was conferr'd at his Ordination, being that St. Paul was the single Person who conferr'd it, therefore 'tis most certain, the Apostle had a hand in *Timothy's* Ordination, Q. E. D.

And that Mr. P. may find another Instance of an Ordination, which was perform'd by a single Person; where Twelve were Ordain'd at the same time, I alledge the Ordination of the Disciples at *Ephesus*, upon whom St. Paul laid his Hands,

Acts

Acts 19. 6. Observe, says Dr. Whitby, that after the Imposition of the Apostles Hands, these Men spake with Tongues, and prophesied, receiving the same Gifts of the Holy Ghost, which the Apostles and others had received to fit them for the Ministry which was then generally performed by such Gifted Men commissioned for that Work by the Holy Ghost thus falling on them; whence we find these Prophets and Teachers ministering to the Lord in their Assemblies, Acts 13. And Beza on the place makes not the least doubt of this Ordination; for these are his Words, *Celeberrima tandem illic constituta Ecclesia—hujus autem Ecclesie Primitiæ fuerunt isti 12. Prophetico Spiritu donati, ac proinde procul dubio illius Duces ac Gubernatores constituti.*

But, says Mr. P. tho this Writer says St. Paul had the only hand in his Ordination, he is forced afterwards to abate of his Confidence. For, after he has, to solve a Difficulty and secure Episcopacy, wrested the Apostle's Words, he pleads that the Presbytery if it relates to Officers, must signify Apostles or Bishops. I did plead so, and 'tis begging the thing in question to say they were simple Presbyters. But wherein I am forced to abate of my Confidence, or have wrested the Words, I am yet to learn; the Accuser knows, I have given only the Sense of the ancient Commentators, tho' he is pleased to call it my Wrestling; and 'tis certain, St. Paul had the only hand, as he himself tells us in conveying the Character; supposing all the rest to be Presbyters; and if the Word *πρεσβυτεριον* relates to the Office, as the Ancient Fathers and Calvin affirm, wherein have I wrested the Words? I endeavoured, indeed, to keep Dissenters from wrestling them, by shewing, that they might not only be taken in another sense, but that according to the sense in which Dissenters take them, they are not serviceable to their Cause, there being no Difficulty in allowing them as they are render'd; they being an evident Instance of an Episcopal Ordination in the strictest sense.

But, says Mr. P. I don't wonder that he will treat a particular Text as he does, since for the same Reason he sinks the Reputation of the very Canon of Scripture. See p. 3. I have observed other Instances of such a Conduct in Men of that Party. Now let him observe what he pleases, if his Observations be no better grounded than what he says of me, they are all very false. In pag. 3. I affirm, that we have the same Evidence that Episcopacy (i. e. Bishops as distinct from and superior to Presbyters) was the Government of the Primitive Church, in the purest Ages of Christianity, that we have for the

the Canon of Scripture. This I affirm to be true; but I can't see how, *for the same Reason*, I sink the Reputation of the very Canon of Scripture. For, as the Bishop of Bangor observes, *Def. Episc. Ordin.* p. 13. "That this ought to be accounted sufficient Evidence by our Brethren in this Case, is plain, from their receiving the same Testimonies in another most important Point, which is not and could not be plainly settled in the Scriptures themselves. For 'tis upon the Testimonies of Ancient Writers in all Ages, that both they as well as we believe the Books of the New Testament to have been extant from the Apostles Days, and to have been written by the Apostles, or by Persons approved of by them." Now since we have the Testimonies of those same Ancient Writers for the Government of the Church, mayn't the same be called the same without sinking the Reputation of the very Canon of Scripture? Upon Examination, I believe it will be found, that those Instances of Disregard to the Ancient Writers, so commonly observ'd in Mr. P. and his Party, have had a fatal Tendency to raise up Libertines to sink the Reputation of the very Canon of Scripture, and to plague the World with new-invented Principles. Mr. P. gives us a Specimen of this *Def. 2d Part*, p. 94. for there he freely owns, that *perhaps his Notions fall in with no one Party entirely*. And is not this pretty assuming, that a Man will adventure to advance a Notion, as to Church Government, which falls in with no one Denomination of Christians entirely?

I cited, says Mr. P. *Matth. 16. 19.* to shew that such things as belong'd to several in common, were sometimes spoken of as peculiarly belonging to one; and that therefore the Directions given to Timothy and Titus, will not prove they were to act alone, and that 'tis as consistent they were to have others to join with them, as 'twas that Peter was to have others join with him in Receiving the Keys, and the Power of binding and loosing. This is easy and plain; but he does not say a Word to weaken the Force of my Reasoning. For as to his Observations that Peter was the only Person to whom our Lord could say, *Thou art Peter*, and that the rest were not Sons of Jona, however learned they may seem, they are nothing to our present purpose. What an unbecoming Part does Mr. P. act here? Did I not say a Word to weaken the Force of his Reasoning? What could weaken it more than to prove that the Case was not parallel? That This was spoken as peculiarly belonging to Peter, and that it had never belonged to the other Apostles in common, if they had not received the same Commission afterwards, *Matth. 18. 18.*

and

and whatever he may suppose of our Lord's saying, *Thou art Peter, and blessed art thou Simon Bar Jona*, it plainly shews, that *Peter* was the Person spoken to, and that He, and not the rest, receiv'd the Keys, and the Power of binding and loosing at this time. But as to *Timothy's* Case, I deny that 'tis as consistent he was to have the Ephesian Presbyters to join with him, as *Peter* was to have others join'd with him in receiving the Keys; for where are the Things spoken of, as peculiarly belonging to *Timothy*, intimated, as belonging to the Presbyters of *Ephesus*? Did I not challenge Mr. P. and all his Brethren, to produce the Text. But this he knew he had nothing to say to, and so he pass'd it over, as *nothing to our present purpose*. But what if such things as belonged to several in common, are sometimes spoken of as belonging to one; does it therefore follow, that the Directions given to *Timothy* and *Titus* belong'd to the Presbyters of *Ephesus* and *Crete*, without producing the least Proof that these Directions ever belonged to them in common? 'Tis altogether as reasonable to say, that the Presbyters were to join with *Timothy* in bringing the *Parchments*, as in the *same Commit Thou*.

So that the thing is not so *easy and plain* as he imagins, according to his sense of it. The thing, indeed, is very plain and easy, according to the literal and grammatical Sense of the Words; it being as plain and easy as Words can make it, that the Directions given to *Timothy* and *Titus* prove that they were to act alone in the Affair of Ordination. But this is nothing to Mr. P's purpose, but very much to the contrary; and therefore 'twas, in my Opinion, but a poor Refuge to assert, that I did not say a *Word* to *weaken* the *Force* of his *Reasoning*.

There is nothing else, says he, *that a common Reader will not be able to see thro'*; Let them, for 'twas design'd for them to see thro'; I am persuaded they will see a great deal that he hath nothing to say to; and withal let them judge, since Mr. P. *thought an Answer adviseable*, whether this which he has published be tolerable.

The Gentleman, says he, *betrays his Genius by applauding a Writer, whom the most sensible of his own Party contemn; who, indeed, has disgraced every Controversy he has pretended to write in; and who, I will be free now to say, did not understand our Controversy, wherein I give the late Bishop of Sarum's Judgment, who declar'd it to one of his own Clergy, from whom I had it*. Now the Gentleman apprehends, that without prostituting his Genius, he cannot take up with Mr. P's Reason for this, it being so like what N. E. declared to Mr. Jago, and he being well

well assured that some of the *most sensible*, were so far from contemning that *Writer*, that they have applauded the Performance, as being *full of Learning and Reason*. The Work speaks its own Worth, let others say what they please of it; and whatever Strefs Mr. P. may lay upon the Clergyman's Story, the impartial Part of the World will take their Measures from the Merits of the *Work*, not the Opinion that any Body has of the *Writer*, who has made it appear, that he understands the Controversy too well for some, and that, I suppose, is his Crime. As to his *disgracing every Controversy*, I shall only observe with the Learned Doctor, that *this is a lively Specimen of Mr. P's Despising Faculty*, which with the *Air* he gives himself, *Def. p. 31.* That *HE is sometimes tempted to go by the Rule, which the late Excellent Bishop Burnet is said to have observed in Judging of the Clergy*, shews that the Doctor did not mistake his Man.

But says Mr. P. *If this Writer has such an Apprehension, let him try how he can answer the Parallel in my Eighth Letter; or, since I have always writ upon the same Scheme, let him try to pick out of that Gentleman's Writings an Answer to the Demonstration I have now given of my Opinion.* As to his pretended Demonstration, if I am not much mistaken, I have shewn how little it deserves the Name; I can pick enough out of the *Summary View*, to convince me of his Mistakes. His Eighth Letter, it seems, goes a begging for an Answer; and since it hath not for many Years been thought worthy of more than the *Censura Temporum* gives it, *p. 42. N. 2.* I shall not be singular. *Let him try how he can answer the Remarks made on his Eighth Letter in the Censura*, and especially the Queries about *Valentinus's Horus*. There are two Learned Persons with whom Mr. P. has to do, on the Subject of *Ordination*, the Learned and Judicious Dr. Hole, and the Ingenious and Modest Examiner of his *Rational and Moral Conduct*, which will bring Work enough upon his hands, before he makes good the Title of his Sermon, *Presbyterian Ordination prov'd Regular*; so that he need not call for more till that is ended.

His concluding Paragraph runs, with an *Air* of mighty Superiority, thus, *Tho', by the way, he must think of writing more pertinently and consistently, if he expects I shall hereafter take notice of him.* Now whether I have writ pertinently or consistently, or whether my Answer has lost any of its Force under the Weight of his Defence, must be left to the

Reader's Judgment. But, for the future, I expect he will give a cleaner Glove; for, if he sends the same dirty one again, I shan't think my self bound to stoop to take it up.

ERRATA.

Page 5. l. *uk*. read Article. p. 16. l. 20. read attempt. p. 26. l. 15. read is to be.

F I N I S.

10. 1A 66



10
a

6.

✓

1